

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/862,471	71 05/23/2001		Mitsuharu Kawaguchi	NU-01007	7469	
30743	7590	08/23/2006		EXAMINER		
WHITHAN 11491 SUNS		IS & CHRISTOFF	TREAT, WILLIAM M			
SUITE 340	SEI HILL	3 KOAD	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
RESTON, V	/A 20190)		2181		

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Examiner-Initiated Interview Sumn	09/862,471		KAWAGUCHI, MITSUHARU		
Lammer-initiated interview Juliii	iai y	Examiner	Art Unit		
		William M. Treat	2181		
All Participants:		Status of Applicatio	n:		
(1) William M. Treat.		(3)			
(2) Marshall M. Curtis.		(4)			
Date of Interview: 11 August 2006		Time:			
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ If Yes, provide a brief description:	☐ Applica	nt's representative)			
Part I.					
Rejection(s) discussed: Rejection of claims 13-15.					
Claims discussed: Claims 13-15.					
Prior art documents discussed: Prior art of recod.					
Part II.					
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING TH See Continuation Sheet	HE GENEI	RAL NATURE OF WHA	T WAS DISCUSSED:		
Part III.					
 ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a state directly resulted in the allowance of the applicant the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a state did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief 	cation. The separate r	e examiner will provide a ecord of the substance	a written summary of of the interview, since	the substance	
(Examiner/SPE Signature)	(Applicant	/Applicant's Representa	tive Signature – if app	ropriate)	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner explained that he had inadvertently listed claims 13-15 as being rejected when he had intended that they merely be objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim. The examiner explained that should applicants rewrite claim 13 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims such a claim would be allowable over the prior art of record.

M2-4

WILLIAM M. TREAT PRIMARY EXAMINER